DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 642 HE 005 761

TITLE Implementation of Continuous Planning and Coordination of Postsecondary Education Within the Michigan Department of Education.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Educational Coordination; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Post Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan

ABSTRACT

This document portrays the rationale, scope, and basic assumptions underlying the planning for and coordination of postsecondary education in Michigan. Michigan's postsecondary institutions must address a pluralistic society. In addressing the diverse learning needs of the state's citizens, the primary responsibility of the planning and coordination system is to respect and compliment the individuality of the people being served. Therefore, the primary function of planning, as fostered by the State Board of Education, is the development of an educational system that permits a broad range of choices to the people of Michigan. This document contains the rationale for planning; the scope of higher education planning and coordination; the basic assumptions of planning and coordination; the planning function; and the coordination function. Appendix exhibits include the basic responsibilities and goals of Michigan postsecondary education. (Author/PG)

ED 094642

implementation of continuous planning & coordination of postsecondary education

Michigan Department of Education

HE 005 761

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

State Board of Education

	Term Expires
Dr. Gorton Riethmiller, *President* Chelsea	Jan. 1, 1975
James F. O'Neil, *Vice President* Livonia	Jan. 1, 1975
Dr. Michael J. Deeb, *Secretary* Mt. Clemens	Jan. 1, 1977
Barbara A. Dumouchelle, *Treasurer* Grosse Ile	Jan. 1, 1979
Marilyn Jean Kelly Troy	Jan. 1, 1977
Annetta Miller Huntington Woods	Jan. 1, 1979
Dr. William A. Sederburg East Lansing	Jan. 1, 1981
Edmund F. Vandette Houghton	Jan. 1, 1981
Dr. John W. Porter, *Superintendent of Public Instruction* Chairman, Ex-Officio	
William G. Milliken, *Governor* Member, Ex-Officio	

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTINUOUS PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION Within the Michigan Department of Education

Michigan Department of Education

August, 1973

FOREWORD

The attached document entitled: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTINUOUS PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION Within the Michigan Department of Education, is presented in order to portray in a meaningful, yet concise way, the rationale, scope, and basic assumptions underlying the planning for and coordination of postsecondary education in Michigan.

During the past several years the State Board of Education has attempted, within the limits of its resources, to achieve many of the goals identified in the 1969 State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan. The State Board of Education's successes in this regard have been impressive, yet much remains to be done. It has become readily apparent during the past twelve months that "planning" is imperative to serve as a basis for appropriate "coordination" of the future growth and development of postsecondary education in Michigan. Only through comprehensive and continuous planning can coordination occur which will provide equal educational opportunity for Michigan adults, quality instructional programs and services for Michigan postsecondary institutions, and the effective utilization of available state resources.

It is within this framework for planning that the attached document is presented to the public for its thoughtful consideration and reactions.

John W. Porter

JOHN W. PORTER
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

August, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rationale..... 1

The Scope of Higher Education Planning and Coordination..... 3

The Basic Assumptions of Planning and Coordination..... 6

The Planning Function..... 6

The Coordination Function..... 8

Conclusion..... 9

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTINUOUS
PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
Within The
Michigan Department of Education

I. The Rationale

The primary purpose of Michigan's postsecondary education delivery system is the provision of an environment in which people can achieve the life-long learning goals which they have established for themselves. It is from this perspective that the State Board of Education enunciated its position in 1965 relative to its constitutional mandate to plan and coordinate postsecondary education; and which became the first goal of the State Plan for Higher Education in 1969. The Board stated that:

> The role of the State Board of Education as the principal agent for general state planning and coordination of higher education is clear, and in this capacity it is the duty of the State Board of Education to plan for and encourage the orderly development of a comprehensive state system of education beyond the secondary level that will effectively and efficiently serve all the needs of the state.

To carry out its responsibility of higher education, the State Board realized that involvement of the education community was essential; therefore, an accompanying goal of the State Plan reads:

> The State Board of Education will establish AS NEEDED advisory committees of college and university BOARD MEMBERS, administrators, faculty members, AND STUDENTS. In addition, the State Board, from time to time, will create other advisory committees as may be appropriate.

As a result of the above frame of reference, the State Board of Education adopted a document in 1969 entitled "The State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan." In this document 38 goals were set forth as "directional" statements for the planning and coordination functions of the staff of the Department. In its present form the document provides a sound base upon which a revised state plan can be developed. In the context of these goal statements, the staff began to address the many issues --

of planning and coordination for what was then called higher education and what is more appropriately now referred to as postsecondary education.

Subsequent to the development of these directional goal statements, the State Board of Education categorized its responsibilities in the area of postsecondary education within five broad fields. Subsumed within each basic responsibility, staff has grouped the 38 goal statements as follows:

1. To engage in comprehensive and continuous planning and coordination at the postsecondary level involving both long-range and short-range goals: Goals 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 34

2. To develop a statewide system for collecting appropriate information from both public and private institutions as well as government agencies: Goals 6, 9, 10, 32

3. To approve or disapprove all proposals for the establishment of new public institutions, and to approve or disapprove the establishment of new programs at those institutions, and to make recommendations concerning the reallocation or discontinuance of existing programs: Goals 2, 17, 19, 25

4. To review and make recommendations concerning operating and capital budgets of public institutions: Goals 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38

5. To administer or coordinate state and federal programs resulting in grants to postsecondary institutions or students attending these institutions: Goals 14, 15, 16 (Ref. Exhibit A)

It is within this context that the postsecondary planning and coordination staff is addressing the full range of functions incorporated in a dynamic planning and coordination system. In the process of addressing each of these functions, it has become clear that significant efforts must be expended to consclidate the work of the staff in these areas. Further, in order to insure that the results of these efforts are mutually complimentary, it is essential that the future design of, and implementation plan for, the planning and coordination system for postsecondary education be developed in concert with the development of a revised State Plan for postsecondary education. This approach is taken with the assurance that the individual will remain the central focus of the planning process.

II. The Scope of Higher Education Planning and Coordination

One of the failing ingredients of most state agencies charged with the responsibility of planning and coordinating higher education is that the state agency has not been able to identify to the satisfaction of the policy decision makers, such as the Governor and the Legislature, and the institutions of higher learning, just what the terms "planning and coordination" entail, specifically, what will be planned and what will be coordinated. This has been the case in the State of Michigan for the past seven years and has resulted in the Governor calling for a commission to study higher education in the state.

For almost a year the staff of the Department of Education has been in the process of developing a series of recommendations that respond to this problem. In addressing this question, the State Board of Education believes that the scope of higher education planning and coordination entails planning activities in four broad categories. It is to specific issues within each of these four areas that staff is preparing planning documents to be considered by appropriate decision making bodies. (Exhibit B) The major areas and issues which have been identified to date follow:

A. Planning to Meet the Needs of the Adult Population in Michigan

1. Planning in relation to postsecondary enrollment projections and manpower needs

2. Planning for equality of access

3. Planning for meeting the needs of students, once enrolled, through additional supportive activities

4. Planning in terms of freedom of choice so that students may, to the extent feasible, be able to select institutions because of program or services

5. Planning in relation to student financial assistance programs in order to assist in paying for the cost of post-secondary education

6. Planning for the provision of community college services statewide

B. Planning in Terms of Instructional Program Offerings

1. Planning in terms of program articulation between secondary occupational schools and postsecondary institutions and between community colleges and baccalaureate institutions and private institutions

2. Planning in terms of the role, scope, and diversity of program offerings within the system of postsecondary education

3. Planning in terms of long-range new programming and reassessment of existing program offerings

4. Planning in terms of the relationship between graduate and professional enrollments by program and manpower needs of the state and nation

C. Planning for Postsecondary Services to Meet Statewide Expectations

1. Planning for an effective teacher preparation and professional development program in order to serve local school districts more effectively

2. Planning effective statewide library services to support the instructional program aspects of postsecondary educational institutions and the adult population

3. Planning relative to non-collegiate services provided to those adults who do not aspire to acquire collegiate credit for additional educational services

4. Planning for off-campus services which entail the concepts of coordinating field services and collegiate services without walls

5. Planning for intra-state regional delivery of instructional services

D. Planning in Terms of the Information Relative to the Fiscal Needs of the Institutions

1. Planning and development of integrated data management and program systems

2. Planning necessary to ensure that educational quality was being achieved

3. Planning relative to the fiscal needs of the individual institutions and the total postsecondary delivery system

4. Planning relative to the facility needs of the institutions to service the citizens of the state

5. Planning relative to institutional size and in relationship to the total state postsecondary delivery system

The planning documents which are being drafted will address the twenty specific areas of concern identified above, as well as other areas of relevant concern that might later be identified. These documents will include (1) a listing of pertinent assumptions, (2) an identification of appropriate goals, (3) a summary of the crucial elements of the situation, (4) a review of alternatives available, (5) specific recommendations for action in concert with appropriate rationale, (6) specific guidelines for the evaluation and analysis of the recommended plan of action, and (7) some indication of the proposed time frame involved.

Within these four broad planning categories, the scope of higher education planning and coordination is identified. The difference between planning and coordination is the difference between what is presented within the twenty areas as the need for planning, and what decisions the policy makers have to reach in order for effective coordination to occur. Because no clear distinctions have been drawn between the concepts of planning and coordination, confusion as to roles has resulted. In fact, one must realize that coordination cannot take place until after documented and objective planning has taken place. Within this context it is believed that Michigan has emerged as one of the few states that has clearly articulated what needs to be done in order to develop an effective system of higher education planning and coordination and, at the same time, in distinguishing clearly between planning on the one hand and coordination on the other. It is conceivable that executive and legislative support under any type of state system must be given to a single agency in order to develop a planning capability. Once the planning capability has been developed and recommendations set forth, the decision as to coordination has to be made by those who are in the policy making arena.

III. The Basic Assumptions of Planning and Coordination

Prior to considering the specific functions appropriate to the concepts of planning and coordination, certain basic assumptions are noted:

1. Planning functions performed at one level within the total system should supplement the efforts at the other levels. Statewide as well as institutional goals based on the public interest must be adopted which provide a basis for the postsecondary educational system's priorities.
2. The system's experience and understanding within its various levels is invaluable.
3. The development of a State Plan can best be achieved when there is a conscious effort to involve all aspects of the system and concomitantly greater acceptances of the finished product will be realized.
4. The decisions which are reached within the system are the result of an extensive use of an advisory committee structure.
5. The planning and coordination system is developed around a comprehensive communication system which is responsive to the several parts of the total system.
6. The planning and coordination system recognizes itself as an information source to the executive and legislative system.

The Planning Function:

In implementing the planning and coordination system to which the State Board of Education is committed, the Board has drawn a significant distinction between the concepts of planning and coordination. This distinction revolves around the fact that the concept of coordination must have as its antecedent all the input and feedback processes which are included in the actual planning effort.

Having made this distinction, the elements of planning are:

1. Identification of key problems --

   It is the responsibility of each participant in the planning process to input to the system, problems which impinge upon the ultimate goals of the planning and coordination system.

2. Accumulation and interpretation of data related to the system's problem --

   Data management is crucial to the activation of a viable planning process. Inadequate data bases and interpretative capabilities can result in misdirected human, as well as fiscal, resources.

3. Analysis of the interrelationships which exist among the various subsystems within the total postsecondary educational delivery system --

   Naive planning can be destructive to the best interests of the population the system intends to serve. It is essential that, as plans are developed, the ramifications to all concerned be explored. Such an effort recognizes the constantly developing nature of good planning.

4. Identification of future alternatives in relation to present conditions --

   This function recognizes the developmental nature of planning as well as recognizing the fact that change is a phenomenon to be expected. Finally, this function requires all the participants in the planning process to analytically consider the future.

5. Assessment of the effect of introducing new variables into the present delivery system --

   Often the concept of planning is destroyed by this very function, for those involved in the planning process fail to either consider the ramifications of introducing new approaches, etc., or they impose new variables oblivious of their effect. It is crucial in performing this function that all the planners involve themselves in extensive dialogue among one another prior to the introduction of any changes.

6. Identification of the most desirable of the modified alternatives as goals -- This function recognizes the necessity of flexibility in the planning process. One logical outcome of an ongoing, viable planning mechanism is the evaluation of previously identified goals, identification and evaluation of alternatives, and implementation of a mutually-acceptable alternative.

7. Development of a sequential plan for implementing goals -- If planning is not systematic and progressive in nature, the willingness of the planning participants to develop cooperatively a unified delivery system will be short lived.

8. Development of a feedback system for constant evaluation -- The very fact that there is a necessity for a planning system dictates the necessity of an ongoing evaluation system. Planning in its fullest sense is developmental, therefore, the absence of evaluation precludes future developments being based on the strength of the past.

The Coordination Function:

It is on this base of continuous and comprehensive planning that the second major concept dealt with in the Constitution -- namely, coordination -- rests. Regardless of the need for coordination of services, resources, personnel, etc., the absence of an integrated planning system would result in a futile coordination effort.

Given that coordination must be supported by a meaningful planning process, the Department of Education identifies the following as pertinent elements within any well-ordered coordination system:

1. Coordination comes about when adequate planning has identified the need for such coordination.

2. Coordination must be achieved via the expression of leadership from within the total delivery system rather than the exercise of control.

3. Diversification of educational opportunity must be the result of coordination rather than uniformity and rigidity within the postsecondary institutions.
4. Within the scope of coordinated planning, flexibility of delivery must be ensured for each institution as it strives to achieve its purposes and goals.
5. The delivery of quality programming must emanate from such a system of coordination.
6. The recognition of the institution's need for freedom and flexibility in adapting their programs to the particular requirements of the local communities as well as fulfilling their responsibilities to the larger community, i.e., the state, must be an outgrowth of coordination.
7. The system must encourage each institution to function interdependently within the postsecondary educational community, but not to the extent that an institution loses its individual identity.
8. The preparation of rules and regulations drawn from within the coordination system which do not specifically apply to the operation of a single institution, and which do not interfere with the internal management process whereby the local institutional representatives make essential decisions affecting the institution's operations, is necessary.
9. The coordination system must respect the integrity of the structure of the roles and positions of institutional governing board members and administrators.
10. The educational need of the local community and the state, rather than political advantage or expediency, becomes the determining factor in arriving at budgetary recommendations and/or supporting or not supporting program requests in a truly effective coordination system.

Conclusion:

Michigan's postsecondary institutions must address a pluralistic society.

In addressing the diverse learning needs of the state's citizens, the primary responsibility of the planning and coordination system is to respect and compliment the individuality of the people being served. Therefore, the primary function of planning, as fostered by the State Board of Education, is the development of an educational system which provides a broad range of choices to the people of Michigan.

---

[1] The State Plans for Higher Education from the states of California, Oregon, Oklahoma, Florida, Illinois and North Carolina were utilized as resource documents.

EXHIBIT A

BASIC RESPONSIBILITIES AND GOALS

Responsibility No. 1 - To engage in comprehensive and continuous planning and coordination at the postsecondary level involving both long-range and short-range goals.

Goal 1 The role of the State Board of Education as the principal agent for general state planning and coordination of higher education is clear, and in this capacity it is the duty of the State Board of Education to plan for and encourage the orderly development of a comprehensive state system of education beyond the secondary level that will effectively and efficiently serve all the needs of the state.

Goal 3 The State Board of Education will establish AS NEEDED advisory committees of college and university BOARD MEMBERS, administrators, faculty members, AND STUDENTS. In addition, the State Board, from time to time, will create other advisory committees as may be appropriate.

Goal 4 The State Board of Education expects to seek additional methods by which the private institutions can be properly assisted. Therefore, the State Board reaffirms its support for private higher education, and will seek to foster its welfare and development by appropriate measures, consistent with constitutional and statutory provisions and sound public policy.

Goal 5 Because of the increasing demands for greater numbers of technically trained people and the rapidly increasing number of vocational-technical programs in community colleges, it is the intent of the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the four other state agencies responsible for the supervision of proprietary schools, to develop administrative relationships to coordinate the program developments of proprietary schools as part of the overall system of higher education.

Responsibility No. 2 - To develop a statewide system for collecting appropriate information from both public and private institutions as well as government agencies.

Goal 2 As an initial step in carrying out its constitutional mandate, it is the responsibility of the State Board of Education to assemble information concerning the existing educational pattern of each baccalaureate institution and community college and analyze such information in terms of its recognized educational responsibilities and the scope of its services and offerings.

Goal 6 Since revisions of long-range enrollment projections are necessary in determining the need for educational programs, space, and faculty, and because of the important variables affecting the college-going rate, it is the responsibility of the State Board of Education to maintain updated long-range projections of potential and probable student enrollments.

Goal 7 The State Board of Education will continue to take the initiative and encourage the community colleges, public and private colleges and universities, and others involved with education and welfare of our youth to seek out and assist those who have the ability to do the required academic work but who, because of inadequate academic preparation or other reasons, are unable to meet the prescribed admission standards of the institutions.

Goal 8 Therefore the State Board of Education will continue to support and promote the liberal arts programs in the colleges and universities, and encourage all studies which aim at producing responsible members of modern society--citizens who are knowledgeable of our western heritage, appreciative of other cultures, concerned with social problems, and respectful of common human values.

Goal 9 The State Board of Education needs to be informed concerning changes in demands for persons trained for the professions, sciences, and technical fields of various kinds. Therefore, the State Board of Education will encourage and initiate studies of the needs of people for professional preparation in specific areas and exercise leadership in securing the necessary cooperation among the concerned departments of state, professional associations, and the higher education institutions in carrying out such studies.

Goal 10 There is continuous need for studies of society's demands and needs for people with vocational skills. Therefore, the State Board of Education will exercise leadership in promoting and encouraging continuous study of society's demands and needs for people trained in the various vocational and technical skills, and to initiate such studies in its own behalf as circumstances dictate.

Goal 11 The State Board of Education reaffirms its position that the community colleges should admit any high school graduate or other out-of-school person and counsel with him about the programs or courses for which he is prepared and from which he may benefit.

Goal 12 In order that community college transfers to baccalaureate institutions may have the opportunity to achieve their educational goals, the State Board of Education will request baccalaureate institutions to accept special responsibility to admit academically qualified community college transfers, and to provide them with essential counseling and assistance during the period of transition.

Goal 13 Because of the lack of knowledge related to the admission policies and practices of the institutions, the State Board of Education will, in cooperation with the colleges and universities, initiate studies designed to culminate in recommendations concerning admission and retention policies and practices.

Goal 30 Because of the growing concern over rising tuition and fee charges, the State Board of Education will initiate a study and make recommendations concerning the entire gamut of student charges by the public baccalaureate institutions and community colleges.

Goal 31 Baccalaureate institutions shall file financial information upon request consistent with terms of such definitions of accounting and reporting terms as are agreed upon by the institutions and state agencies involved. In addition, the State Board of Education will cooperate with the baccalaureate institutions to bring about a speedy completion of an accounting manual that will be acceptable in meeting the uniform accounting and reporting needs of the state.

Goal 35 As a result, the State Board of Education will assist and encourage the public baccalaureate institutions and the public community colleges to arrive at optimum utilization of their facilities and improved operating efficiency wherever possible; always in light of the need for quality in the education processes.

Responsibility No. 3 - To approve or disapprove all proposals for the establishment of new public institutions, and to approve or disapprove the establishment of new programs at those institutions, and to make recommendations concerning the reallocation or discontinuance of existing programs.

Goal 17 For the purpose of enabling the State Board of Education to make annual reassessments of higher education, each baccalaureate institution and community college shall file its updated five-year plan of operations showing its educational roles, its actual and proposed inventory of programs, its required faculties and staff, and its projected operating and capital costs, including self-liquidating facilities.

Goal 18 As a result of the growing demands for off-campus programs including educational television and mail order AND CONTINUING EDUCATION courses at the undergraduate, graduate, and graduate-professional levels, and because there is not now a clear direction as to the overall state planning and coordination of such activities, the State Board of Education will develop, in cooperation with institutional representatives, a statewide plan whereby off-campus education can be encouraged, fostered, and coordinated.

Goal 19 As a matter of policy the State Board of Education will, from time to time, recommend that certain community colleges, especially metropolitan community colleges, undertake such of the high-cost vocational-technical programs as they are particularly suited to offer.

Goal 20 In order to avoid unnecessary duplication of institutions, facilities and programs, it shall be the policy of the State Board of Education that, where community colleges exist, the community college shall serve as the postsecondary area vocational school for the said area.

Goal 21 Due to the great need for pre-vocational technical skills at the secondary level, and in the interest of efficiency and economy in teaching, the State Board of Education will establish appropriate standards for secondary area vocational centers and community colleges to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs and facilities.

Goal 22 For the purpose of stimulating cooperative educational, research, and public service programs, the State Board of Education will strive to expedite coordination of regional programs within the state, with neighboring states, and with private organizations.

Goal 23 Although it is not clear that there is a unique optimum size for educational institutions, it is believed that an educational institution cannot wisely be expanded indefinitely. Therefore, the State Board of Education will study and recommend a state policy concerning institutional size, and the distribution of students among the institutions.

Goal 24 The State Board of Education reaffirms its policy of April, 1966, that the existing branches should be provided their autonomy in an expeditious manner.

Goal 25 The State Board of Education is responsible for making recommendations concerning the formation and scope of new public institutions. In recommending the establishment of any new public institution, it will offer guidelines to the new governing board on how the public institution should grow, the level of instruction to be offered, and the variety of professional programs and the timing of their introduction.

Goal 26 The State Board of Education believes every resident of the state should have access to community colleges services. It is therefore the policy of the Board that all areas of the state be included in independent community college districts.

Goal 27 The State Board of Education will, based upon appropriate advice, establish guidelines for locating community college sites within the respective districts in such a way as to provide the greatest services to all of the people of the district and surrounding territory.

Goal 28 The State Board of Education shall, based upon appropriate advice, establish guidelines for determining and appropriateness of residence halls on community college campuses, and the construction of a residence hall by a community college shall require the prior approval of the State Board of Education.

Goal 29 It is the policy of the State Board of Education that no community college should be transformed into a baccalaureate institution. If and when it is determined that an upper division or four-year institution is needed in an area, it should be established in its own right, rather than as an outgrowth of an existing community college.

Responsibility No. 4 - To review and make recommendations concerning operating and capital budgets of public institutions.

Goal 32 The present system of counting and reporting students by the public baccalaureate institutions is practical and acceptable to most agencies. The State Board of Education will adopt the system of counting and reporting students as set forth in Table 3.

Goal 33 Because the educational programs of community colleges vary widely and some are penalized by the standard per student appropriation, the State Board of Education, with the advice of the boards of trustees of community colleges and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, will recommend a new way of determining appropriations for community college operations consistent with their roles as institutions of higher education.

Goal 34 It shall be the policy of the State Board of Education that, when a student attends a community college as a nonresident student because he does not live in a community college district, the excess of the tuition charged over the standard charge to resident students should be paid by the student's local school district. When a student from a community college district attends another community college in order to enroll in a high-cost vocational-technical program or a specialized program not available in his community college, the sending community college should make provisions to pay the difference in tuition charges.

Goal 36 The importance of annual revision of projections for operations cannot be stressed too strongly because conditions constantly change. Therefore, in keeping with its constitutional mandate to advise the legislature, the State Board of Education will carry on a continuous study of the operating needs of both the baccalaureate institutions and community and junior colleges.

Goal 37 Due to the emerging role of the community colleges, the State Board of Education will give added study to need for the state to share in the cost of land acquisition. The State Board will review the present procedure and proportion of the state share of capital costs provided community colleges.

Goal 38 The projected costs of facilities in terms of future enrollments and programs is an important undertaking if sufficient students spaces are to be available. The State Board of Education will submit annual capital outlay projections to the Legislature, consistent with the constitutional mandate to advise concerning the financial requirements of higher education.

Responsibility No. 5 - To administer or coordinate state and federal programs resulting in grants to postsecondary institutions or students attending these institutions.

Goal 14 The State Board of Education will foster the coordination of state, institutional, and federal funds available to students, and will recommend that sufficient state financial assistance be available to every individual who is academically qualified to undertake a higher education program of his choice.

Goal 15 The State Board of Education will seek legislative action to provide sufficient funds for the state guaranteed loan fund and to accomplish greater participation by financial institutions.

Goal 16 The establishment of an incentive awards program that would identify high school students from disadvantaged backgrounds who can benefit from further education, is of utmost importance if more young people are to be given an opportunity for higher education. Therefore, the State Board of Education will continue to give high priority to the implementation of such a program and will urge the legislature to provide sufficient funds to meet the financial needs.

STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
IN MICHIGAN

EXHIBIT B

September, 1973